



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

as to be almost a certainty that there was no *trial* before Jewish authorities, but simply a police inquisition resulting in the formulation of charges, and that the word *Synedrion* used in this connection outside of the Gospels deserves to be put in quotation marks.

Another displeasing feature of the volume, which deserves mention, is the poor proofreading which it has received. With no malice aforethought on his part, no less than 18 annoying misprints forced themselves upon the attention of the reviewer. In a cheap Teubner edition this might be condoned; but this is not a cheap edition, nor a cheap book.

It is fitting, however, that we should leave this volume with more pleasant thoughts. In spite of the small defects noted, it remains a rare work of science and art combined in a time prolific of books. May the promising seed in it sown find fertile soil and produce fruit a hundred fold!

M. SPRENGLING

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

---

*Recent Developments in Textual Criticism.* An Inaugural Lecture Delivered before the University on June 6, 1914. By ALBERT C. CLARK. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914. Pp. 28. 35 cents.

The first development in the field of textual criticism, which Professor Clark discusses, is the increased attention now being given to local scripts. A copyist who had before him a manuscript written in some other *scriptorium* than his own often fell into error from his ignorance of the compendia in use in the other locality, and in this connection the study which has been made in recent years of the Irish script and of the Beneventan hand have been especially helpful in detecting errors of this sort and in restoring texts.

The important bearing upon textual criticism which the examination of mediaeval catalogues and an acquaintance with the history of a given manuscript have is happily illustrated by the case of the lost Tornaesianus which contained Cicero's letters to Atticus. It had long been believed that this manuscript was copied in the fifteenth century and freely interpolated. Now the Tornaesianus is known to have been in the collection at Cluni in the twelfth century, and deserves the description which Lambinus gave of it as "very ancient."

That the papyri discovered during the last quarter-century lend no support to the theory that extensive interpolations were made in manuscripts at a late date is well known to scholars, and consequently the author dwells briefly on this point.

The importance of prose rhythm, however, in restoring a text he discusses at some length. He even goes so far as to hold that the later Latin writers must be re-edited to rid them of the metrical faults which the emendations of editors have introduced.

The concluding pages of the address treat of the difficulty which confronts the editor of a text when one class of manuscripts containing a given piece of literature has passages which are omitted from another class. In such cases are we dealing with interpolations in the first class or with omissions from the other? Professor Clark applies to these cases an interesting test: If at certain points in a manuscript the same number of letters is omitted, this was probably the number of letters in a line of the archetype, and a line of the archetype has been overlooked at these points by a copyist. The same reasoning applies of course to a passage in which the number of omitted letters is a multiple of this unit. Thus the Vatican manuscript of Cicero's orations omits certain passages, found in other manuscripts, of 28, 56, 84, 112, and 140 letters. These were evidently omitted by the scribe of the Vaticanus and not interpolated in the other manuscripts which contain them. The application which the author has made of this principle in his recently published *Primitive Text of the Gospels and Acts* has done much to weaken our confidence in Griesbach's canon: "brevior lectio potior."

It is clear that the new textual criticism will be conservative rather than skeptical, and that it will tend to substitute objective and mathematical tests for subjective methods. A better knowledge of the history of manuscripts, a study of papyri, and of the stichometry of archetypes go to show that interpolations were not so frequently introduced as it has been sometimes supposed, while a more exact acquaintance with the rhythmical practices of an author will reveal the questionable character of some of our accepted emendations. However, in spite of the author's confidence in its value, the reviewer feels a bit skeptical about the free use of rhythmical principles in restoring a text, and will await with interest the application of this method in Professor Clark's forthcoming volumes of Cicero.

It is pleasant to find an unusually large proportion of American scholars, Dr. Loew, Miss Ballou, and Professors C. U. Clark and Shipley, mentioned among those who have helped to bring about this advance in textual study.

Those who, like the reviewer, had the good fortune to know Professor Ellis, will read with pleasure Professor Clark's prefatory remarks on the genius for friendship which his predecessor had, and will agree heartily with the sympathetic appreciation which the lecturer gives of the services rendered to classical scholarship by Professor Ellis. But the finest tribute which the writer pays to the memory of his predecessor is to be found in the address itself, which exemplifies admirably the dictum upon which, as we are told (p. 4), Professor Ellis insisted most earnestly that "during the last thirty years all or nearly all the principal contributions to an enlarged knowledge of Greek and Latin authors have been based on an investigation of manuscripts of a minute and laborious kind unknown before."

FRANK FROST ABBOTT